

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/671,468	HASEGAWA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Daniel J. Ryman	2616

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Daniel J. Ryman.

(3) _____

(2) Dexter Chang.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 27 April 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 13, 18, 22 and 35-37.

Identification of prior art discussed: NA.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Daniel Ryman

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner suggested amendments to the claims to correct typographical issues and to resolve 35 U.S.C. 112, 2d paragraph, issues. Specifically, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112 issues, Examiner suggested amending the claims, as listed in the Examiner's Amendment, to (1) clarify that the phase change creates the phase-change point and (2) clarify which interval of the three listed (transmit interval, receive interval, and interval in which effects of crosstalk are received) is referred to by "said interval".